

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR A	TTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,462 10/23/2001	Chester G. Nelson	P-8851.00	4002
27581 7590 03/24/2005		EXAMI	NER
MEDTRONIC, INC.	_	BOCKELMAN, MARK	
710 MEDTRONIC PARKWAY NE			
MS-LC340		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-5604		3762	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Applicat	on No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/035,4	62	NELSON ET AL.	W)				
Office Action Summary		Examine	r	Art Unit				
			Bockelman	3762				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communicate Reply	ation appears on th	e cover sheet wit	th the correspondence add	ress			
THE MA - Extension after SD - If the pe - If NO pe - Failure to Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) or reply is specified above, the maximum statute or reply within the set or extended period for reply will by received by the Office later than three months after patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no exication. days, a reply within the statory period will apply and vill, by statute, cause the app	vent, however, may a re tutory minimum of thirty vill expire SIX (6) MON' plication to become AB.	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this con ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
Status								
1)□ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed	on						
2a)⊠ T	his action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b	) This action is	This action is non-final.					
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition	n of Claims							
4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	laim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the apple of the above claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are with laim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) <u>10-20</u> is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction	thdrawn from cons						
Application	n Papers							
9)□ Th	ne specification is objected to by the I	Examiner.						
10)□ Th	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	pplicant may not request that any objection		<del>-</del>					
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to be	•		•				
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a) [	cknowledgment is made of a claim fo  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority do  Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	ocuments have been been been been been been been be	en received. en received in A ents have been le 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National S	Stage			
				•				
Attachment(s				(0.7.2.4.12)				
2) Notice of 3) Information	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT lo(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO- 	152)			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snell USPN 6,249,705 in view of Bowman-Amuah USPN 6,332,163.

Snell teaches a server arrangement comprising a server 102, a storage element (database 103) through which downloaded program updates pass through, and an interface 107 which may be wireless or modem (wires) for communicating with a plurality of network programmers 104<sub>N</sub>. The network programmers are used to communicate and program a plurality of IMDs 105<sub>N</sub>. Security measures established within the server/interface system are described in col. 4 lines 40+ and include the encryption of data and measures to protect patient data. Data integrity is performed so as to ensure the validity of data exchange, which thus intercepts data contaminants that may be included in the data. (i.e. viruses etc.) The transmission protocol may be TCP/IP as well as other types of internet protocol (column 3 lines 30-42).

Snell teaches wireless connections between the server and the IMD programmers but does not specifically mention optical fibers or radio transceivers, however such wireless interface transmissions are regarded as well known in the art.

Additionally, Snell discusses the physican establishing a secure connection in the Table which the ordinary skilled artisan would understand as a login password or other similar security device that would deny unauthorized use. Finally, it is notes that to use a server administrator interface to service and to regulate transmission of information through the server was well known at the time of the invention.

While Snell does not teach Gateway server antivirus software, such is conventional as seen in Bowman- Amuah which uses a conventional software, namely "Netscape Proxy Server--high-performance server software for replicating and filtering access to Web content on the Internet or an intranet. Provides access control, URL filtering, and virus scanning." To implemented the Snell system in a conventional internet with a gateway server having virus protect would have been obvious.

Claims 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ji et al 5,623,600 in view of Snell USPN 6,249,705.

Applicant's apparent point of novelty is the provision of a security at the level of the server in an internet based communication system for serving programmable IMD's. Ji et al is cited as demonstrating Servers with data integrity assuring means that scan file for viruses (etc.) to incercept corrupt data were well known at the time of applicant's invention. To have provided the use of such a server for transmitting data to IMD programmers would have been obvious given that server based IMD programming systems were also known at the time of applicant's invention, which is demonstrated to be true by the citation of Snell 6,249,705.

Applicant's arguments filed 1-5-2005have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the examiner is using hindsight it combining art. THe examiner disagrees. Snell teaches a intranet system meeting applicant's claims limitations. Applicant argues that the difference, a gateway server antivirus system would be unobvious yet most such systems, if not all use these to prevent hacking and contamination. Therefore applicant's argument are deemed unpersuasive.

## Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3762

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark W Bockelman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4941. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (571) 272 -4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mulbick

**MWB** 

March 21, 2005